DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 554 PS 011 917

AUTHOR Gotts, Edward E.: And Others
TITLE Marketable Preschool Education, 1975-76. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 76
CONTRACT NE-C-3-0094
NOTE 67p.: For Final Report FY 77, see ED 152 418.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Field Tests: *Formative Evaluation: Inservice Teacher Education: *Instructional Materials: Material Development: *Parents: *Preschool Children: Questionnaires: Resource Materials

ABSTRACT

This final report of the Marketable Preschool Education Program (MPEP) discusses (1) a formative evaluation field test of Aids to Early Learning (AEL) materials and (2) the editing, revision and placement (with publishers) of the Home Visitor Training Package. Learning activities files for home and classroom use as well as several parent discussion guides were field tested in 44 sites located in 14 different states. The field tests focused on the usability, content, age-appropriateness and readability of the files and guides. In addition to the formative evaluation of the new materials, a process evaluation of the feasibility of preparing a weekly guide to accompany the television program, "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood," was conducted. Field test data are discussed and recommendations are advanced. Activites related to the publication of the Home Visitor Training Package are indicated. The evaluation forms used as well as inservice material designed to sensitize preschool teachers to dimensions of child development are appended. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED196554

FINAL REPORT

MARKETABLE PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

1975-76

Edward E. Gotts

Del Lawhon

Alice M. Spriggs

Division of Early Childhood
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

August 31, 1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Appalachia Educational Lab.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS011017

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Research and Development Background	2
Formative Evaluation Field Test	5
Home Visitor Training Package Activities	28

Appendices

A. Forms for Evaluation of Files Sets

B. Form for Parents' Review of the Guide

C. Forms used for the Evaluation of the Parent Coordinator Guide and Parent Guide

D. Errata for Classroom Files

E. Errata for Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files

F. Child Development: Inservice Resource

FINAL REPORT

MARKETABLE PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

1975-76

Introduction

This Final Report discusses the two 1975-76 scope of work items of Contract NE-C-3-0094, Modification 6. The major scope of work item, a formative evaluation field test, is discussed first. Field test activities were conducted simultaneously for several products prepared under earlier modifications of this basic contract. Attention is given to the earlier research and product development work. The current formative evaluation, which was the next required step in the research and development cycle, is then presented.

Thereafter, the Final Report details progress on the remaining scope of work item, i.e., editing, revision, and placement of the Home Visitor Training Package. The Report consists primarily of a progress account of these activities, including the present status of the placement process.

Research and Development Background

Preliminary Research

The Aids to Early Learning (AEL) materials are an outgrowth of the Home Oriented Preschool Education (HOPE) experiments and of subsequent research refinements to HOPE accomplished up to the present under the Marketable Preschool Education Program (MPEP) effort. The latter research was designed to a) document competencies that the typical child should have by age six, b) validate learning activities which could produce these competencies in young children, c) identify an optimum mix of learning activities for preschool children of different developmental ages, and d) support assessment of children's readiness for learning within particular competency areas.

Various strands of research focused on each of the preceding four areas. In the first area, a program of research was conducted using national and Appalachian panels of child development experts; more than 900 Appalachian parents verified and further refined the earlier findings. Results from this work were extended by literature search. Together these methods led to identification of 59 competencies applicable to children by the age of school entrance. In a related conceptual activity, general goals, performance statements, and criterion statements were prepared for each competency.

The second area's effort involved using the competency base to identify learning activities which might foster each competency at three, four and five years of age, respectively. A national panel of child development and early childhood education experts rated the appropriateness of five sample learning activities for each competency. This process was cycled through a second approximation. The resulting learning activities became the models or examples from which the Classroom Learning Activities Files and the Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files were developed.

Third, a study of children's play, via an extensive literature search coupled with expert panel ratings, identified play levels and natural play activities of children associated with particular competencies. From these, judgments were made concerning children's readiness for learning of particular competencies and competency clusters, and determinations were made of the optimum mix of competency-related learning activities for developmental threes, fours, and fives.

The fourth area of inquiry was how to determine children's learning readiness in order to permit accurate instructional assignment. A population of developmental items was collected from the existing test literature. These were arranged and judged regarding their possible applicability to assessing child readiness in the 59 competency areas. Only previously validated items were considered. Items were further aggregated into 14 competency cluster subsets to simplify instructional planning in the field and to permit eventual shortening of the instructional instrument. Programs are allowed to use this instrument or the Alpern-Boll Developmental Profile or other accepted developmental tests to determine the child's placement. While the latter instruments cover only five competency clusters, approximate conversion tables have been produced that serve satisfactorily for many instructional assignment activities. Ultimately, however, it is expected that the instrument designed to accompany the Files will prove most serviceable.

Results

Recent Aids to Early Learning include the following National Institute of Education (NIE) products: The Classroom Learning Activities Files, the Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files, and two Parent Discussion Guides (i.e., Parent Guide and Parent Coordinator Guide). These products were developed during the 1974-75 contract year by the MPE staff with cooperation

and assistance from outside consultants. Completion of these products permitted MPE to propose a formative evaluation field test of the above four products during the 1975-76 contract period. Other Aids to Early Learning products completed earlier under MPE contracts include the Home Visitor Training Package and A Competency Base for Curriculum Development in Preschool Education.

The original HOPE experiment and its replications (1968-1973) provided experiences to children through three program components: a) a weekly home visit, b) a weekly group experience in a mobile classroom, and c) a daily television lesson which was accompanied by a printed Parents' Guide. A fourth component was subsequently added: d) parent discussion groups. As will now be evident, correspondences exist among these program components and the Aids to Early Learning products identified earlier above. Under NIE sponsorship specific products were developed to support operation of each of the four components, as described below.

The Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files were designed as a basic resource for use by home visitors. (The further adaptations to day care use were in response to expressed needs in the field.) The Home Visitor Training Package likewise supported the home component. Similarly, the Classroom Learning Activities Files were created to permit operation of HOPE-like group experiences for young children. The Parent Discussion Guides were to be a resource to the newest program component, parent groups.

So far, no Aids have been discussed for the television component. NIE and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory had worked together from 1973-1975 to plan production of a new children's television series titled Around the Bend, but the financial resources required were too great. When a television series could not be produced, the MPE staff began negotiating for permission to adapt an existing series to this purpose, in order to insure availability of this HOPE component. These negotiations eventuated, at the beginning of

the 1975-76 field test, in the adoption of the Mister Rogers' Neighborhood series. To integrate this into the MPE competency-based curriculum, however, was an ongoing task that is described later in this report. MPE staff prepared a weekly lesson sheet to accompany the broadcast. It is titled AEL Visits Mister Rogers. Parents' Guide.

Field test requirements were different in the case of these television Guides. Unlike other new Aids products, the prototype Guides had already been tested from 1968-1973. Thus, these new Guides closely followed their prototype, except that they now supported use of a different television series. Based on the foregoing rationale, the formative evaluation planned for the Guides did not relate to the basic design of the materials but rather to the a) feasibility of preparing, producing and distributing them in interface with the schedule of the producers of Mister Rogers' Neighborhood and b) match of the Mister Rogers' series to the MPE objectives and whether appropriate adaptations could be effected.

Formative Evaluation Field Test

Overview

The field test as proposed and conducted by the MPE staff was exceptional in several ways. First, the design of the field test used varied types of programs. That is, programs were selected to provide considerable user heterogeneity. Programs varied in size (number of children and staff), geographic location (14 states), use of professional and non-professional staff, and socioeconomic status (SES) of children. Program types included: Head Start, day care, kindergarten, other public school programs, nursery school, child development programs, programs for the handicapped, and various home-based programs. The design further called for analysis by program type

and extent of implementation. Thus, a variety of programs was to be accepted, whereas the method of analysis would permit conclusions about the acceptability and usability of the AEL materials with varied user audiences. Further, users were assisted to incorporate the Files and Parent Discussion Guides into their own programs, i.e., no direct attempts were made to control programs beyond assisting in proper installation of the new materials. This approach was followed in order to ascertain the usability and acceptability of the Aids materials under somewhat typical field conditions. In a sense, this variety allowed MPE to determine the broad applicability of the AEL materials to "field use."

Program inclusion criteria were, nevertheless, established prior to dissemination of the material to local programs. One criterion was that programs would use the Aids to Early Learning as part of their curriculum. An affirmative indication of intent to use the materials was accepted, however, without exacting further assurances. In fact, some programs were allowed to participate just to see if they could "make it." A second criterion was that programs would be able to participate for about three full months or longer, thus providing sufficient time for program staffs to move beyond familiarization into actual use of the materials in their settings. A third criterion for inclusion was that programs using the Files would make assignments to children based upon individual child developmental levels. During initial negotiations programs were allowed to use AEL-provided assessment tools or to substitute their own devices/practices, so long as the intent of developmental age-graded child assignments was implemented.

Another exceptional feature of the field test was that data were collected and monitored by the participating local programs and individual users within these programs. The MPE staff developed forms, and made suggestions about what data would be helpful. MPE staff further provided training and consul-

tation regarding data management. In the end, however, it was up to the local programs to collect data. Eventually, they would supply MPE with selected program data. Attempts were made to verify the quality of these data by visitation, and cross checking internal consistency of responses. A few uniform descriptions of how materials were used were asked of all programs.

A third exceptional feature of the field test was that users of the material, by their comments, suggestions, and evaluations, directly affected the specific revisions made in the AEL materials. This was accomplished by soliciting and analyzing user reaction to the smallest possible units of the materials, i.e., reactions to the individual learning activities. More typically, field users provide reactions to larger or more global aspects of packaged materials. In the present study, field users were invited to react to each activity card that they used, or that they considered using but rejected for some reason. Users did, in fact, react at this level to specific features of the individual learning activities.

The design of the field test and the method used to obtain data encouraged and even required programs to become more oriented to the individual child in a developmental sense, as they implemented their curriculum. Prior to field test, information provided by the local programs indicated that only three out of 44 programs carried out some sort of assessment as a possible basis for their instructional decisions. Two did so for curriculum planning and one for program evaluation. The remaining 41 programs had no formal assessment or explicit curricular planning other than the "maybe" approach, (i.e., the "maybe" approach says, "Let's do this activity and maybe it will help the children.") As a result of the field test training, instructions contained in the Files' Manuals, and Lesson Plans provided by MPE, many programs became able to evaluate their children, determine levels of development, and plan appropriate age level activities to meet the needs of individual children. Comments made by several

programs suggested that this approach to curricular planning would continue because staff not only endorsed it but more importantly had developed necessary skills and know-how through participation in the field test.

Purpose

Part of the 1976 scope of work for MPE was to "Edit, reproduce and to conduct field tests of the a) learning activities files for home use, b) learning activities files for classroom use, and c) parent discussion guides.... Prepare final editing specifications for these three sets of products, based on results of this 1976 field test."

To accomplish this, specific objectives were established:

1. Usability--to determine whether the Files and Parent Discussion Guides were usable in various program settings.
2. Content--to determine appropriateness of the content of the Files and the Parent Discussion Guides.
3. Age-appropriateness--to determine whether the Files were appropriate for children ages three, four, and five.
4. Readability--to determine the readability of the Parent Discussion Guides.

Selection of Field Test Sites

No inflexible guidelines were applied during site selection, although in communications with potential sites the following criteria, as previously discussed, were used: 1) programs were to use the AEL materials either as a significant curriculum resource or as total curriculum; 2) programs were to participate for a minimum of 90 days; and 3) programs were to provide MPE staff with certain data collected at the local level.

Initially, 50 programs responded to MPE's solicitation for field test sites, and of these, 44 were able to follow through with their agreements. The

six programs which, following an initial agreement, were not able to participate mentioned one or more of the following reasons: 1) internal problems, such as staff turnover, or financial difficulties (closing of centers), 2) lateness of the year, unable to complete 90 days, 3) or were utilizing another curriculum and felt a change at that time would result in too much confusion for staff.

Field test sites were located in 14 different states: West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Tennessee, Oregon, Kentucky, Missouri, Virginia, Wisconsin, South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, and Idaho. Information on program types appears below in Table 1.

Table 1

TYPES OF PARTICIPATING PROGRAMS

Type of Program	No. of Programs	No. of Classrooms	Home Visitors	Approximate No. of Children
Head Start	21	93	103	3,000
Day Care	9	54		855
Kindergarten	5	17	2	300
Handicapped	4	6	13	400
Nursery School/Child Development	5	27		500
TOTALS	44	197	118	5,055

Materials Field Tested

Classroom Learning Activities Files. The Classroom Files are a set of approximately 900 learning activities to be used in center-based early childhood programs to help children learn and develop in each of 59 important early childhood competency areas. The 59 competencies cover comprehensively the five broad areas of development: cognitive, language, motor, self-help and habits, and

social/emotional. Approximately 15 activities were prepared for promoting each of the 59 competencies. Each activity had been pre-validated by experts and was field tested as a part of the present work for usability, content, and age-appropriateness. Activities are written for use with preschool children of developmental ages three, four, and five. An Instructional Manual, instructional assessment device, and weekly lesson plans are available with the Classroom Files.

Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files. These Files are designed for use by parents and paraprofessionals in early childhood education, who plan curriculum for use in either day care or home-based settings. Divided into 59 competency areas, the Files provide more than 900 activities which have been pre-validated by expert review and field tested in the present work for usability, content, and age-appropriateness. An Instructional Manual, instructional assessment device, and weekly lesson plans are available with these Files.

Discussion Guides for Parent Groups. This material was prepared as a two volume set: the Parent Guide for parents and the Parent Coordinator Guide to be used by a professional assisting in the organization and operation of parent groups. The emphasis is on involvement by parents in their child's learning across cognitive, social-emotional and perceptual-motor domains. The Guides also provide activities for parents and specialized information on normal and delayed child development as well as other special topics.

Data Collection Procedures

Teacher Comments. Teachers using the two sets of Files were asked to provide written comments on each activity when used. All comments could be made directly on the individual activity cards, in designated locations. Teachers were requested to record the number of times each activity was used and to record brief comments regarding any suggestions for change or revisions.

Each user received a list of questions on which they might comment, if applicable. Each user was further instructed that whenever a user marked a card to indicate use but made no further comment, this would be interpreted as meaning the user found the activity to be acceptable and usable. Comments were explicitly requested on the materials' appropriateness. At the end of the field test, those activity cards which had been used were temporarily returned to MPE staff to allow the recording of number of times used and specific comments made.

Evaluation of Files. An evaluation form (Appendix A) was developed for each set of Files to permit global appraisals by users. Forms for the two Files sets were similar, but certain questions were developed to obtain data regarding the settings in which they were respectively used. Forms were provided with the Files to program directors to be distributed to personnel and then returned to the MPE staff at the end of the field test.

Evaluation of Parent Discussion Guides. Two evaluation forms were developed by MPE staff and provided with the Guides to local programs to be distributed to parent coordinators and program parents. A one-page, five question form (Appendix B) was developed for parents to respond to in evaluating the Parent Guide. Another form (Appendix C) was developed for parent coordinators to use in evaluating the Parent Coordinator Guide.

Results and Discussion

By way of review, the major purpose of the field test was to collect data which would lead to final editing specifications for the AEL materials. In order to accomplish this, certain objectives were stated to guide data and information collection. Those objectives relating to the Files were: 1) usability - to determine whether the Files were usable in various program settings (i.e., Head Start, day care, programs for the handicapped, etc.);

2) content - to determine appropriateness of the content of the Files; and 3) age appropriateness - to determine whether the Files were appropriate for children ages three, four and five. From the data gathered to fulfill these objectives, final editing judgments were made.

The first two objectives for the Parent Discussion Guides are basically the same as those for the Files, whereas the third is different: 1) to determine the usability of the Parent Discussion Guides in the various program settings; 2) to determine whether the content of the Guides was appropriate; and 3) to determine the readability of the two Guides.

Data will be discussed as they relate to the Files, then the Guides, respectively. In the discussion relating to the Files, the data pertaining to the Classroom Files will be presented first. Then the Day Care and Home Files' findings are presented based on all completed forms. This will eliminate any confusion which might result from shifting back and forth from one set of data to the other.

It will be necessary before considering the data, however, to discuss a potential source of confusion regarding the numbers of participating units presented earlier in Table 1. Of the 197 participating classrooms, only 147 actually used the Classroom Files; the remainder used Day Care and Home Files or both. Further, one professional level home visitor used the Classroom Files, while some classroom teachers used the Classroom Files in both their rooms and for home visitation. Moreover, Day Care and Home Files were used both in day care rooms (about 57 percent of users) and home visitation (about 43 percent of users). Finally, in several programs multiple users together completed a single evaluation form based on their consensus regarding the Files. These multiply overlapping patterns of usage make direct analyses from Table 1 inappropriate.

Instead, the degree to which the results reflect the range of users, based on a satisfactory return rate, is better understood by the following facts. There were 148 Classroom Files and 175 Day Care and Home Files distributed to actual entering participants. Of these entering participants, 58 Classroom Files users and 35 Day Care and Home Files users started, and then their programs ran into unanticipated difficulties (usually of funding or getting staff properly prepared to begin) which delayed their completion beyond the deadline, even though the users and MPE staff agreed to their continued involvement. Overwhelmingly these users have expressed general satisfaction with the Files and have requested permission to participate in the impact evaluation beginning Fall, 1976. They appear, therefore, in Table 1, but are not reflected in the present results. Results for all other entering users are reflected in the report below. The entering users who could not complete were all from either Head Start or day care programs (which also helps explain their funding difficulties), although both Head Start and day care programs continued to be well represented among the programs which were able to complete the evaluation.

Files Data

- Objective #1: Usability--to determine the usability of the Files....

Classroom Files. In response to the question, "Were you able to use the Files in your position?" all users completing the evaluation form answered "yes." As to the extent that it served as a curriculum, 28.1 percent indicated that it served as a "total" curriculum, 21.1 percent reported "over one-half," and 33.3 percent utilized the Files "from one-fourth to one-half." The major reason noted for not using the Files more (if used less than 50 percent) was "lack of time" (38.6 percent). Only one user responding to the question indicated that the "activities were not appropriate."

The data collected on the number of activities used strongly suggest that the Classroom Files are usable. The average number of activities used was 288.7, per teacher. This amounts to nearly one-third of the total number of activities contained in the Files. This is an average of 4.8 activities each day for the field test time period. In the lesson plans developed to be used in conjunction with the Files, the number suggested for each day was five.

Kindergarten teachers utilized the Files the most with an average of 901 activities per user. Day care users were second with 674, Head Start, third with 163, programs for the handicapped averaged 163, and nursery and child development programs averaged 74.8 per user.

Usage data indicate that all major parts of the Files (i.e., those competencies relating to the five broad areas of development), were utilized at a high level as noted in Table 2. These data allow some judgments regarding the areas that users emphasized the most.

Table 2

USAGE OF ACTIVITIES BY AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT

Area of Development	Total Number of Activities Used	Number of Competencies Within Group	Average Use of Activities Per Competency
Motor	2,253	6	375
Cognitive	4,964	16	310
Language	3,243	12	270
Self-Help & Habits	3,024	13	232
Social & Emotional	2,464	12	205

The Instructional Manual for the Classroom Files was rated "adequate" by 84.2 percent, "incomplete" by 8.8 percent and 7 percent noted that it was "hard to understand." In response to the question concerning the use of AEL Weekly Lesson Plans, 19.3 percent indicated they used them "100 percent of the time," while the suggested Plans were not "used at all" by 35.1 percent of the users, who relied wholly on their own mix of emphases. The major reason cited for not using the Lesson Plans was "received too late." This apparently has reference to a shipping problem which prevented immediate delivery of the Lesson Plans with the Files. Further, in some programs they were not disseminated from a central office to local classroom teachers early enough.

In summary, the foregoing data support the view that the Classroom Files are usable by Head Start programs, nursery and child development programs, programs for the handicapped, day care operations, and public kindergartens. A possible exception is discussed later in the "Summary and Conclusions."

Day Care and Home Files. Ninety-three percent of those utilizing the Files indicated that they were able to use them in their staff positions. Five respondents were not able to use the Files. In response to another question, all users indicated that the Files were utilized to some extent as part of the curriculum. The Files were utilized as a "total" curriculum 6.7 percent; "over one-half," 25.3 percent; "from one-fourth to one-half," 24 percent; "less than one-fourth," 13.3 percent; and "as a resource or for ideas only," 30.7 percent. The major reason for not using the Files more (if used less than 50 percent) was "lack of time." Eight users (from a single program) indicated that the activities were "inappropriate."

The Instructional Manual was rated as "adequate" by 78.7 percent, "needed more information" by 10.7 percent, and 10.7 percent did not respond

to this question. The Lesson Plans were used primarily as a "reference" and 34.7 percent indicated they were "not used at all."

Since the Day Care and Home Files were to be used in home based programs as well as center based programs, it is of interest to note the extent that each group utilized the Files (Table 3).

Table 3

HOME VISITORS' AND CENTER USERS' UTILIZATION OF THE DAY CARE AND HOME FILES AS A CURRICULUM

Extent of Usage	Home Visitors	Center Users
Total	12.5%	2.3%
Over 1/2	34.4%	18.6%
1/4 to 1/2	9.4%	34.9%
Less than 1/4	18.8%	9.3%
Resource Only	25.0%	34.9%

A higher percentage (46.9 percent) of home visitors indicated usage of the Files as a "total" and "over one-half" curriculum, compared to center users, 20.9 percent. Both types of users utilized the Files "less than one-fourth" and as a "resource only" to about the same degree, 43.8 percent for home visitors and 44.2 percent for center users.

Home visitors used an average of 202 activities per visitor, during the field test period. The Lesson Plans accompanying the Files recommended ten activities a week per child or 120 for the 12 week field test period. Assuming that each visitor served eight children of this age, recommended usage would have been 120 times eight or 960 activities. Center users averaged 76 activities per user, during the same time period. This is an average of 1.2 activities per day. The Lesson Plans suggested five activities per day.

This information indicates that both types of users utilized the Files a great deal less than the level called for in the Lesson Plans.

In determining the usability of the Day Care and Home Files the data allow for a reserved assertion of "yes, they are usable." The data indicate the Files are more usable in a home based program than in a center based program, and are more usable as a "resource" in both program types than as a main curriculum.

- Objective #2: Content--to determine appropriateness of the content of the Files....

Classroom Files. In response to the question "Were the activities written so that they were easy to understand and carry out?" Ninety-six point four percent responded "yes" and 3.5 percent said "no." The majority of users indicated that the Files required no classroom reorganization (86 percent) and 78.9 percent noted that the Files required "a good mix of materials, most of which are available in your classroom."

Comments supplied by the users provided additional information regarding the appropriateness of the content of the Classroom Files. Comments were compiled for each activity and these were analyzed to determine content appropriateness. Teachers were instructed that "no written comments" implied that the activity was satisfactory. The average number of comments made was 1.9 per activity and these were generally positive and constructive. When the number of comments was compared to the number of times the activity was used, overwhelming support was found for the appropriateness of the content.

To illustrate this procedure, seven comments were made on Activity C-1-1. Three were statements that the activity was "good," "the children enjoyed this activity," etc. Four offered comments regarding how they varied the activity in usage, how certain aged children responded, etc. This particular activity was used 49 times during the field test. This allows one to conclude

that the content of this activity was appropriate. This procedure was carried out for all the activities contained in the Classroom Files. Also, from this information editing specifications were made for specific parts of some activities.

Day Care and Home Files. In response to the question "Were the activities written in such a way that they were easy to understand and carry out?", 54.7 percent indicated "always" and 34.7 percent said "most of the time." When asked about the materials required to use the Files, home visitors (40.6 percent) said "that parents were asked to provide too many materials." Center users also noted this as the major problem. Apparently, center users did not understand that all materials were to be supplied by the center, and parents were to supply materials only when a home visitor was involved. This confusion points up the need to provide differential directions and guidance to these two different user groups.

Analysis for content appropriateness, utilizing comments supplied by users, was conducted with the same procedures as with the Classroom Files. Few comments were made on the activities, and these were generally positive and constructive in nature. The number of comments was compared to the times used, which allowed the generalization that the content was appropriate.

- Objective #3: Age-appropriateness--to determine whether the Files were appropriate for children ages three, four and five.

Classroom Files. The Files were used in programs where the ages of the children were three, four and five. In some programs there was homogeneity of age, and in others a heterogeneity of age. No problems were noted either in the usage (number of times used) of the activities, or in the comments made by users on the activities. The comments showed that some minor adaptations were made on particular age-variations, but users generally supported the age-appropriateness of the Files.

In response to the question, "Did you use the Age-Variations suggested on the activity cards?", 78.9 percent said "yes," and 21.1 percent said "no." Comments made in response to an open-ended question, "How did they work for you?", suggest the users found them to be very usable and appropriate. Forty-five comments were made, and a sample of these is as follows:

> "The age-variations helped us determine which activities were appropriate for which children."
>
> "They turned out well."
>
> "Because of the age grouping, the experience was simplified; it worked well."
>
> "Excellent - they really helped as far as maturity levels of the children are."
>
> "They were helpful with those having some developmental lag."
>
> "Very well - understood what to expect from a 3-year-old on the activity as well as the 4- and 5-year-old."

Day Care and Home Files. The programs utilizing the Day Care and Home Files as a home-based curriculum served children of more heterogeneous ages than did center users. Generally, the home visitor was working with children ranging in age from infant to five-year-olds. Some center users worked with children of heterogeneous ages and other users with homogeneous ages. From the comments supplied by both types of users, no major problems were noted with the age-appropriateness for three-, four- and five-year-old children. Based on the comments, editing changes were made in 14 age assignments for specific activities.

Parent Discussion Guides

Parent Guide. Forty-six program personnel indicated they delivered or used the Guide with program parents. MPE had supplied 1,800 copies to be used in accordance with local program objectives and efforts in working with parents. Accompanying the Guide was a one-page evaluation form (Appendix B) to be completed by parents and returned to MPE.

Evaluations were returned by 205 parents, and these were analyzed by the MPE staff to determine the usability, content appropriateness, and the readability of the Guide. The low return rate apparently does not reflect the usage, since many programs communicated to MPE staff that they were disseminated, and used by parents, but they were unable to get parents to complete the evaluation form. Of those returning the form and responding to the question "Did you find the Guide useful?" the average parent's response was "useful," where that is the next to most favorable category. In response to open-ended questions "If the Guide were revised, which parts would you leave in?" and "What would best be left out?", parents indicated that all parts should be left in and no parts left out. There were suggestions made regarding information which should be "added" (or "more of") in the Guide. These were topics dealing with health, safety, medical problems, and special problems of young children. Most of these topics could be provided for in the re-edit process by including cross references to other resources. The majority of parents noted that the Guide was "very readable."

Parent Coordinator Guide. This Guide was disseminated to local programs having staff who functioned as parent coordinators or leaders. A three part evaluation form (Appendix C) accompanied the Guide to be returned to MPE for analysis. Information concerning specific parts of the Guide was obtained by having the users make checks corresponding to their reactions to certain aspects or sections. Categories were checked if users agreed very strongly or strongly or if they disagreed very strongly or strongly. There was also an intermediate category for neutral reactions. The number of checks in these categories was tabulated to determine the most frequent response.

Across all questions, the Coordinator Guide received positive responses on the average, even after only a short field test. It is noteworthy that users found the Guide to be very useful and well organized. This item was

rated the highest by users. The sections on toys and early warning signs were both rated relatively high on the average. The sections of the Manual receiving the lowest ratings were on the use of junk, the ABCs of parenthood, methods of conducting meetings, leadership skills needed to deal with problems arising in leading a parent group. Although these four areas were rated the lowest, the ratings tended toward the neutral range and did not indicate the sections should be omitted. The ratings do suggest possible needs for revision to increase appeal.

It is of interest to note that the size of parent groups, and frequency of meetings seemed to influence the ratings. Coordinators with higher parent numbers in these categories rated particular items differently than coordinators with small parent groups. This relationship, however, was small enough that not a great deal is to be made of it.

AEL Visits Mister Rogers. Parents' Guide

Background. AEL Visits Mister Rogers was published weekly to help parents provide learning experiences for their children. It was based upon the content of the Mister Rogers' Neighborhood television program. The four-page publication, which was produced for 21 weeks (February 23 through July 23, 1976), consisted of a general message to the parents, a synopsis of each day's show, and learning activities to be carried out in the home. The general message to the parent was adapted from the "Parent Corners" of the Files and was related as closely as possible to the theme of the week's shows. Each daily program was previewed, and the content was matched to the appropriate developmental competencies. Activities that would further develop those competencies were then selected from the Day Care and Home Files. If necessary, work sheets were prepared and inserted in the publication.

Preparation of the Publication. The process whereby each publication was produced consisted of several steps:

1) The Mister Rogers programs had to be dubbed onto video cassettes by WQED-TV, Pittsburgh and sent to Charleston.
2) The programs were next reviewed by a curriculum writer and/or editor to learn the content of the programs and to determine which competencies were related to the programs.
3) The "Parent Corner" had to be selected and adapted, a synopsis of each program written, and appropriate learning activities selected. The synopses of the programs were usually written by the early childhood education editor and the learning activities were selected by the curriculum staff member.
4) This copy was then sent to Family Communications in Pittsburgh. There all content was reviewed first by Barry Head, Vice-President, and later, Barbara Davis. Any suggestions or changes in content were conveyed by telephone and incorporated into the copy.
5) Copy was taken to Advertising Incorporated for printing. After copy was sent, an early childhood education staff member proofed copy for format and errors.
6) The publication was printed and returned to the Marketable Preschool Education offices for mailing to the programs participating in the field test.

The primary problem encountered during this production was insufficient time. Fred Rogers was re-editing the content of the programs prior to their broadcast and occasionally this delayed WQED-TV from dubbing the tapes. Also, dubbing at WQED-TV could be done only when the equipment was not required for other scheduled use. Therefore, a delay in receiving videotapes

led to a tight schedule for reviewing shows, writing of content, approval from Family Communications, printing, and distribution. Also, an occasional problem would develop in the printing operation which would delay the mailing to programs.

In order to carry out all steps of this procedure, staff would need at least six weeks of lead time to be assured that the materials would be in the hands of the users (parents) in time for proper usage. For direct bulk mailing to parents, an additional week of lead time would probably be necessary. Instead of six weeks, the Marketable Preschool Education staff seldom had even four full weeks lead time.

The TV Program and MPE's Competency Base. Fred Rogers' philosophy regarding early childhood education emphasizes the social-emotional growth of the young child. He places much emphasis upon the child's development of a positive self-image. Therefore, the content of his programs can be related very closely to the MPE competencies that stress social, emotional and self-help/habits. In order to incorporate in the Parents' Guide activities which would develop other child competencies, it was necessary for the writers to relate the activities to concepts that were usually not major foci of the television program. Other philosophical issues await further discussion between MPE and Family Communications staffs.

The Parents' Guides were well-received by program directors who distributed them in various ways: 1) by home visitors, 2) by mail, and 3) by children taking them home from Head Start and day care programs. Parents indicated that they were interested in the activities suggested in the Guide. However, as MPE staff later learned, some parents were unable to use the Guide as recommended. This resulted because many families could not directly receive the video signal and also had no access to cablevision to receive PBS programs. Other families in the same communities either

received the signal directly or by cable. Signal reception difficulties were a reason for several programs electing not to use the Guide.

Copies of the Guide were sent at Barry Head's request to David Newell, Public Relations Director for Family Communications. He sent samples of of these Guides to station managers who televise Mister Rogers' Neighborhood. MPE staff received inquiries from some of these stations regarding the possibility of receiving the publication in quantity for public relations purposes and/or as one of their educational features.

This section has examined specific problems, associated with insufficient lead time, in the preparation of AEL Visits Mister Rogers. More lead time must be arranged if the preparation and distribution of these Guides is ever to be an efficient operation. Only after this is resolved can attention be given to more basic philosophical issues regarding the curriculum match of the Mister Rogers' show to the MPE effort.

Summary and Conclusions

Field test data collected and analyzed on the Classroom Learning Activities Files and Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files, and the Parent Coordinator Guide and Parent Guide were collected for formative evaluation of these new materials. In addition, a process evaluation was conducted of the feasibility of preparing a weekly Guide to accompany Mister Rogers' Neighborhood, based on a tested prototype. The data were not designed to test impact on children's development or on the functioning of parent discussion groups. Impact of the AEL materials will be summatively evaluated in the 1976-77 contract year. However, based upon comments of program directors, teachers and other current users of the materials, some impact on children's development may be inferred.

The Classroom Files were very usable in the various preschool program settings. They were most usable in kindergarten, day care, Head Start, and programs for the handicapped. They were less often used and, hence, possibly less usable in nursery school and child development programs. Even in these latter programs, usage and evaluation data suggest that the Files were indeed usable; they were simply used less in these than the other programs.

The content of the Classroom Files was judged to be quite appropriate, with only minor alterations and revisions deemed necessary. It appears that, with regard to content, programs with differing philosophies and emphases have little difficulty adapting and using the Classroom Files. Also, the Classroom Files were evaluated to be age-appropriate when used with children ages three, four and five. The Instructional Manual was read by all users and rated adequate by the majority. Based on these findings, primarily minor revisions are being made in the Classroom Files and the Manual.

Lesson Plans to accompany the Classroom Files were not utilized by the majority of the users. A reason cited most often was that they were "received too late." This aspect of the program may need additional refinement and reorganization. As a specific remedy, they will be included in the Files rather than supplied separately in future operations. Additional information will be sought during the summative evaluation to determine whether this remedy is effective.

Data analyzed on the Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files suggest that home-based users found them to be more usable in this setting than did center users. Center users indicated more usage as a resource for ideas than as a substantial part of their total curriculum. Home users found the content more appropriate and age-appropriate than did center users. Usage data tended to verify evaluation form ratings. These findings raise questions about how

suitable the Files are for day care use. Specific reactions to the Instructional Manual have led MPE staff to develop separate manuals for home visitors and center users, respectively. It remains to be seen, however, whether separate manuals will offer sufficient, additional guidance and assistance to alter the Files' suitability for center use.

Lesson Plans were little used by these groups except as a reference. Home visitors were more apt to utilize them as a guide than were center users. Lesson Plans will be incorporated into the revised manuals. Additional information will be collected during the 1976-77 summative evaluation of the materials to find whether these changes make a difference in usage.

The two Parent Discussion Guides were evaluated by parent coordinators and parents as very usable and helpful. The content was judged appropriate, and the Guides were judged easy to read by the majority of users. No major changes or revisions were deemed necessary; minor re-editing will be accomplished.

The MPE staff will seek to negotiate with Family Communications for greater lead time to prepare AEL Visits Mister Rogers. Philosophical issues of curriculum match will be explored as well.

Recommendations

The findings and information obtained during the formative evaluation field test lend support to the following recommendations:

1) The Classroom Learning Activities Files should be studied for their impact on the development of young children.
2) That editing of particular activities should be completed, and decisions concerning dissemination be made as soon as possible so this product may be made available to a broad audience of teachers of children ages three, four and five. (See "Errata for Classroom Files" for progress to date. Appendix D.)

3) The Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files may be utilized as a curriculum resource for home visitors and others working with parents and children in a home setting, and that day care or center usage be suggested only on a trial basis pending further study.

4) That revisions of particular activities should be completed and decisions concerning dissemination be made as soon as possible so this product can be made available to home visitors and others working in a home setting. (See "Errata for Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files" for progress to date. Appendix E.)

5) That additional information be obtained on use of the Weekly Lesson Plans for the two Files and revisions be made, as needed, so that teachers and users may be guided in the use of the AEL Files.

6) That the Classroom Files be field tested, formatively and summatively, in the primary levels, grades 1 and 2. Preliminary data from an Appalachia Educational Laboratory study suggest that the 59 competencies are appropriate for most children in these grades. With some revisions, the Classroom Files may provide a transitional curriculum as children are leaving the preschool years and beginning the more formal years of education.

7) That the Parent Discussion Guides be impact evaluated, if it is possible to arrange for this during 1976-77.

8) If sufficient lead time can be negotiated for AEL Visits Mister Rogers, that impact evaluation be conducted of these materials.

Home Visitor Training Package Activities

During the current year, the MPE staff was to edit and revise the Home Visitor Training Package (HVTP) based on the 1975 field test results. Thereafter, the Package was to be placed with a qualified producer/distributor.

Editing. All editing has been accomplished and new photo ready copy prepared of the Package's printed materials. Art work was prepared for the health module; this art work matches the style used in all of the other modules. Earlier HOPE-specific references were relegated to a single chapter, and its character was made more general. Four low quality videotape presentations were replaced with simulations and other classroom activities, designed from the scripts used for the videotapes. A set of simple in-service activities was prepared on child development (Appendix F) to supplement what was the least adequate of the original preservice modules in terms of content.

Placement. Approval for five-year copyright and permission to issue an RFP to publishers was sought from NIE in a letter dated February 15, 1976. This approval was forthcoming, by letter dated March 7, 1976, from Dr. Morton Bachrach, Copyright Administrator.

Professional literature was searched to determine which publishers might be interested in this product, as evidenced by items on their publication's lists and in their advertisements. A first mailing, dated April 22, 1976, of MPE's RFP went to 28 firms. Requests for the RFP added another five at later dates for a total mailing to 33 firms.

Favorable responses (i.e., interest expressed or further information requested) were received from five firms. Three of these subsequently advised that a decision had been made to proceed no further.

Human Sciences Press, New York, and Humanics Associates, Atlanta, have the Package under active consideration as of this date. Both publishers

need to have a commitment from MPE for a pre-publication reduced price purchase of a substantial number of sets of the product. This fact complements the MPE staff's desire to accomplish selected public dissemination activities at the onset of the publishing process. Humanics Associates is interested in the total Package, including audio-visual components. Human Sciences Press will consider only printed items. Humanics Associates is also interested in providing seminars and/or orientation sessions for purchasers, actual or potential.

On balance, from the publisher reactions received thus far, it appears that Humanics Associates, Atlanta, might be a preferred publisher from the standpoint of MPE and NIE. A meeting will be sought in September, 1976, to finalize a joint response from NIE and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory to the publisher offers.

EVALUATION OF CLASSROOM LEARNING
ACTIVITIES FILES

NAME_____ POSITION_____

PROGRAM_____

ADDRESS_____

1. Were you able to use the files in your postion? ( ) Yes ( ) No

2. To what extent did it serve as your curriculum?

   ( ) Total (except holidays)
   ( ) Over 1/2
   ( ) 1/4 to 1/2
   ( ) Less than 1/4
   ( ) Resource for ideas only

3. If you used the files for less than 50% of your activities, what was the major reason?

   ( ) Did not understand how to use files
   ( ) Activities were not appropriate
   ( ) Lack of time
   ( ) Used other curriculum materials
   (Name: _____)
   ( ) Other Please state: _____

4. Did you receive orientation from AEL staff member? ( ) Yes ( ) No

   If yes, was the training:

   ( ) Adequate
   ( ) Incomplete. Would have liked to learn more about:

   _____

   _____

5. Did you read the Instructional Manual? ( ) Yes ( ) No

   a. If so, was it:

   ( ) Adequate
   ( ) Incomplete. Needed more information about:

   _____

   _____

   ( ) Hard to understand

b. If so, did you use the information about typical play activities by age? ( ) Yes ( ) No

Comment: _____

_____

( ) Hard to understand

6. Did you administer the developmental Pre and Post test suggested for use by AEL? ( ) Yes ( ) No

a. If so, did you use the results? ( ) Yes ( ) No

b. Briefly describe how you used the results:

_____

_____

_____

c. Did you use the information which matched competency numbers to scale descriptions? ( ) Yes ( ) No

7. Were the activities written in such a way that they were easy to understand and to carry out? ( ) Yes ( ) No

a. Did you have to [redacted] adapt them? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If so, what kind of changes were necessary:

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you have any handicapped children in your program? ( ) Yes ( ) No
Type of handicap(s):_____

a. Were you able to use the activities with these children? ( ) Yes ( ) No

b. Were there reasons for not using them? (state):

_____

_____

9. Did you use the Weekly Lesson Plans provided by AEL?

( ) Close to 100% of the time
( ) As reference
( ) Not at all

a. Were there reasons for not using them (such as inappropriate, did not understand, etc.)? Please state: _____

_____

_____

b. If you did use them, how would you rate the Weekly Lesson Plans?

( ) Very helpful in planning
( ) Average
( ) Incomplete

Comments: _____

_____

_____

10. Did the use of the files require any classroom reorganization? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If so, describe: _____

_____

11. Do you feel these activities are appropriate for use with small groups of children?

( ) Most of them
( ) Less than 1/2
( ) Less than 1/4

12. Was availability of instructional materials a factor when using the files? ( ) Yes ( ) No

a. Overall, do the files require:

( ) Too many or too expensive materials for a program budget
( ) Not enough material to stimulate child's interest
( ) A good mix of materials, most of which are available in your classroom
( ) That teachers make too many materials
( ) Other: _____

_____

13. Did you use the Age Variations suggestions on the Activity Cards? ( ) Yes ( ) No

14. Would you want to use the files as a long term curriculum for your children? Why: _____ ( ) Yes ( ) No

_____

15. Would you agree to be contacted for a phone interview by an AEL staff member? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If so, where can you be reached by phone throughout the summer?

AREA CODE_____NUMBER_____

DATES AT ABOVE NUMBER_____

EVALUATION OF DAY CARE AND HOME LEARNING FILES

Name_____ Position_____

Program_____

Address_____

1. Were you able to use this File in your position?

   ( ) Most of the time
   ( ) Over 1/2 of the time
   ( ) Less than 1/2 of the time
   ( ) Not at all

2. Did you receive orientation from an AEL staff member? ( ) Yes ( ) No

   If yes, was the training:

   ( ) Adequate
   ( ) Inadequate
   Would have liked more information about_____

   _____

3. To what extent did it serve as your curriculum?

   ( ) Total
   ( ) Over 1/2
   ( ) 1/4 to 1/2
   ( ) Less than 1/4
   ( ) Resource or ideas only

4. If you used the Files for less than 50% of your activities, was there a major reason why?

   ( ) Did not understand how to use Files
   ( ) Felt activities were inappropriate
   ( ) Did not understand how to use the materials
   ( ) Lack of time
   ( ) Other: Please state_____

5. Did you read the instructional manual? ( ) Yes ( ) No

   a. If so, was it
      ( ) adequate ( ) Needed more information about

      _____

      _____

6. Did you use the Weekly Lesson Plans provided by AEL?

( ) Most of the time
( ) As a reference frequently
( ) As a reference occasionally
( ) Not at all

If not at all, were there reasons for not using them:

( ) Inappropriate
( ) Too hard to understand
( ) Other: Please state_____

7. Did you use the Developmental Profile results to plan for individual children? ( ) Yes ( ) No

a. If so, how did you use the results?

_____

_____

b. Did you use the information which matched competency to scale? ( ) Yes ( ) No

8. Were the activities written in such a way that they were easy to understand and carry out?

( ) Always
( ) Most of the time
( ) About 1/2 of the time
( ) About 1/4 of the time
( ) More than 3/4 of the time

a. If not, did you have to make changes? ( ) Yes ( ) No
What kind:

_____

_____

_____

9. Do you have handicapped children in your program? ( ) Yes ( ) No
Type of handicap:_____

a. Were you able to use activities with this child?

( ) Most of the time (more than 3/4)
( ) Over 1/2 of the time
( ) Very little
If not, what were the problems?

_____

_____

10. Did you use the Parent Corners?

( ) For personal information only
( ) Delivered into home
( ) Did not use
Were there reasons for not using them? (State): _____

_____

a. If you delivered the Parent Corners into your homes, do you have a feeling for how they were received by the parent? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If so, explain how parents received/used them:

_____

_____

11. Did the use of the Files require that you change in some ways your approach to working with the child/parent?
( ) Yes ( ) No

Explain: _____

_____

_____

12. Was availability of instructional materials a factor when using the Files?
( ) Yes ( ) No

a. Overall does the File require:

( ) Too many or too expensive materials for a program budget.
( ) Not enough material to stimulate the child.
( ) That parents provide too many materials.
( ) Other: _____

13. Did you deliver or use in any way the Parent Guide with your parents?
( ) Yes ( ) No

a. If so, how was it evaluated by parents:

( ) Too long ( ) Yes ( ) No
( ) Valuable information ( ) Yes ( ) No
( ) Other: _____ ( ) Yes ( ) No

14. Would you find a booklet such as this useful when visiting a parent for the first time? ( ) Yes ( ) No
Why: _____

_____

_____

15. Would you want to use the Files as a long term curriculum for your children? ( ) Yes ( ) No
Why: _____

_____

_____

ANSWER REMAINING QUESTIONS ONLY IF YOU WORK IN A DAY CARE CENTER

16. Did you have to reorganize your classroom in any way to use the Files? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If so, how: _____

_____

Did the Files themselves lead you to see other ways of organizing your area for children's learning? ( ) Yes ( ) No

17. Do you feel these activities are appropriate for use with small groups of children?

( ) Most activities
( ) Over 1/2 of the activities
( ) 1/4 to 1/2 of the activities
( ) Less than 1/4 of the activities

PARENTS' REVIEW OF THE GUIDE

Please answer the following questions about the Parent Guide. Think back about your experiences in the parent group. Refer to the Guide to refresh your memory. Your comments will help us to improve the Parent Guide for future users. Thank you.

1. Did you find the Guide useful? (Circle the number that best describes your answer.)
   - 4 - Very useful
   - 3 - Useful
   - 2 - Only a little useful
   - 1 - Not useful

2. Did you try any of the activities with your child? If so, which ones?

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Was the Guide easy to read? (Circle the number that best describes your answer.)
   - 4 - Very readable
   - 3 - Average
   - 2 - Only parts were readable
   - 1 - Not readable

4. If the Guide were revised, which parts would you leave in?_____

   _____

   _____

   What would best be left out?_____

   _____

   _____

   Is there information which should be added? _____ Yes _____ No

   If so, what?_____

   _____

   _____

5. If you have any other comments on the Parent Guide, please write them here.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

EVALUATION OF THE PARENT COORDINATOR GUIDE AND PARENT GUIDE

Name_____

Program_____

1. Briefly list your major job responsibilities, as they relate to parent education. _____

_____

_____

2. Parent Group

   How many attended (on the average)?_____

   How often did you meet?_____

   What percentage of the children's parents attended?_____

   How many Mothers attended?_____ Fathers?_____

3. List the major objectives of your meeting.

_____

_____

_____

4. Were these objectives met and/or obtained? Yes____ No____

5. What is your overall appraisal of the two Guides?_____

_____

_____

_____

6. In your estimation, what was the parents' reaction to the Parent Guide?

_____

_____

_____

The following statements describe reactions to the Parent Coordinator Guide. Mark them to show whether you agree or disagree with each statement, as it applies to your experience as group leader. Look through the Guide as necessary to refresh your memory about each statement. Circle the number which describes your reaction.

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Neutral, Indifferent or Don't Know
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly disagree

		Strongly Agree (SA)	Agree (A)	Neutral, Indifferent or Don't Know (N/?)	Disagree (D)	Strongly Disagree (SA)
1.	The Guide was well organized and easy to use.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The Guide was helpful in setting goals for the group meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Compared with other available materials, the Guide gave valuable information to help establish a functioning parent group.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The Guide did not provide sufficient help in developing discussion leader skills.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	It helped me to clearly define my role as parent group coordinator.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The Guide did not have enough information about problems which can arise in leading a parent group and ways to deal with them effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	It was very helpful in planning the format and content of the first group meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Suggestions for content were adequate and well-defined.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Compared with other available parent group materials, suggestions for conducting meetings were not specific enough to be of use.	1	2	3	4	5

		(SA)	(A)	(N/?)	(D)	(SA)
10.	Because of the overall quality and usefulness of The Guide, I would recommend it to another parent group leader.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	The section about learning experiences through trips (pp. 20-21) did not relate to objectives of the group.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	The section covering toys (pp. 22-23) as learning experiences was worth including.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	The importance of reading (pp. 24-25) gave the group many new ideas.					

The following statements refer to topics covered in the Appendices.

14.	The section on Childhood diseases and illnesses (pp. 27-28) was complete and was useful to most parents.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The section on Early Warning Signs (pp. 29-31) was valuable as a guide to me as well as to parents in spotting possible handicaps.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The ABC Chart (pp. 32-33) was not relevant to the majority of parents.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The parents in the group enjoyed and used some ideas from the sections, Junk to Save (pp. 44-following).	1	2	3	4	5

Directions: From the list of "Sample Topics for Parent Participation," rate each category as to its importance, in your judgment, for parent groups. Refer to pp. 35-40 of the Parent Coordinator Guide to review the specific content of each area. Use the following responses in rating these topics.

1 - Extremely important content for parents
2 - Useful information; good to include
3 - Of fair importance; include if possible
4 - Not really relevant information

Circle the number indicating your response.

18.	(I) You and Your Child	1	2	3	4	
19.	(II) Health and Safety	1	2	3	4	
20.	(III) You as a Parent	1	2	3	4	
21.	(IV) Child Rearing	1	2	3	4	

Directions: The following list describes specific topics suggested for parent group discussions. Rate each topic as to its importance to parents, based on the amount of discusstion that you encouraged as well as group's own interest in related information. Use the following responses (0-4) to rate each topic. Circle the number which comes closest to describing your group's experience.

0 - Was not tried as a topic in parent group.

1 - Was introduced for discussion but had very limited appeal to parents.

2 - Provided a fair amount of discussion.

3 - Interesting topic to parents; resulted in good discussion (or in requests for more information).

4 - Highly interesting topic; stimulated vigorous and repeated discussion(s).

I.	**You and Your Child**					
1.	Talking with your child	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Working with your child	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Things to do with your child	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Understanding play	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Kindergarten readiness	0	1	2	3	4
II.	**Health and Safety**					
6.	Available Social Services	0	1	2	3	4
7.	First Aid	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Nutrition	0	1	2	3	4
III.	**You as a Parent**					
9.	The father's role	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Working mothers	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Family planning	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Single parents	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Handling problems between you and your child	0	1	2	3	4
14.	How to be a good parent	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Keeping informed on news, movies, magazines	0	1	2	3	4
16.	Budgeting family money	0	1	2	3	4
IV.	**Child Rearing**					
17.	Emotional development	0	1	2	3	4
18.	Special problems - thumbsucking, crying, "no," poor eating or sleeping habits	0	1	2	3	4
19.	Child growth	0	1	2	3	4
20.	Discipline	0	1	2	3	4
21.	Responsiblities - chores, self-control, individual differences	0	1	2	3	4
22.	Sex education	0	1	2	3	4
V.	**Others**					
23.		0	1	2	3	4
24.		0	1	2	3	4
25.		0	1	2	3	4
26.		0	1	2	3	4
27.		0	1	2	3	4
28.		0	1	2	3	4
29.		0	1	2	3	4
30.		0	1	2	3	4

APPALACHIA EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY, IN
P. O. BOX 1348
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25325
304/344-8371

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Field Test Participants (Parent Coordinators and Parent Group Leaders)

DATE: March, 1976

FROM: Del Lawhon, Field Test Coordinator

RE: Evaluation of the Parent Coordinator Guide and the Parent Guide

So that we may obtain a proper evaluation and revision of our early childhood materials being field tested, we need some information from you as a participant.

The Parent Coordinator Guide and the Parent Guide have been supplied to you for your use as a Parent Group Leader. Your comments and reactions are needed on the attached forms for use in our final revision of materials. Please read the attached forms and supply your comments or mark your reactions, as they apply, and return the forms to my attention here at the Laboratory.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your assistance in our field testing of early childhood materials and your willingness to do so.

DL/sb

Attachments

ERRATA

Classroom Files

Activity	Correction
C-1-9	Omit alternative #5
C-1-13	Omit alternative #6
C-2-1	Children can clap loud, then soft, varying this with each clapping sequence. (See C-2-16 for words to poem.)
C-2-12	Use with Competency 15.
C-2-14	Substitute "cat" for "chair" in the first paragraph.
C-3-3	Omit alternative #4
C-3-7	Change "#3" to read "#4" in Age Variation for Five-year-old.
C-3-8	Change "pieces" to "groups" in Alternative #2. Also change "#5" to "#3" in Age Variation for Four-year-old.
C-5-12	Use with 3s, 4s, and 5s.
C-5-15	Add alternative #3 to directions for activity.
C-7-2	Complexity of design could be increased for 4s and 5s.
C-7-10	Add three year old level to Developmental Age Range.
C-8-8	Omit "Age Variation for Three-year-old."
C-12-9	Author of poem is "Rachel" instead of "Vachel" Lindsay.
C-14-10	Add "Age Variation" as sub-heading is omitted.
C-16-7	Delete sentence four from Age Variation for Three-year-old. (Duplication)
C-16-12	Delete sentence six (He must tell...person.) from Activity section.
C-18-1	In alternative #1 use "truck", "car", "racer", etc. rather than "Chevies", "Fords", etc.
C-18-4	Omit alternative #3.
C-18-6	Change "home" to "sound" in the first sentence in Age Variation for Three-year-old.
C-20-1	Change "casualty" to "causality" in Age Variation for Five-year old.

ERRATA
(Continued)

Activity	Correction
C-20-10	Delete sentence five (Do not expect...feels;) from Age Variation for Three-year old. Delete clause from second sentence (but it is...feels.) in Age Variation for Four-year-old.
C-21-13	Delete word "questions" following "Materials".
C-22-11	Use with 4s and 5s.
C-24-7	Add 3-year old to age range. Delete last sentence (The negative not...understand.) from Age Variations for Three-year old. Also delete second sentence (After he demonstrates...sentences.) from Age Variation for Five-year-old.
C-24-8	Add "Please" before each request in examples.
C-26-10	Add 3-year old to age range. Use only two plants instead of four. Put both in light--one with water, one without. Omit measures and graph.
C-26-12	Change "examing" to "examining" in first sentence in Age Variation for Three-year-old.
C-26-13	Delete activity. (Duplication of C-26-11)
C-26-14	Use with 3s, 4s, and 5s.
C-27-1	Change "those" to "these" in Age Variations for Three-year-old.
C-27-7	Change "the" to "they" in sentence one of Alternative #4.
C-32-10	Change "the" to "they" in sentence one of Age Variation for Five-Year-old to read. "With some practice, this child will not have difficulty creating shapes."
C-33-9	Change "stanch" to "stance" in sentence one of Alternative #3.
C-35-20	Omit
C-36-5	Change "keys" to "pegs" in first sentence in Age Variation for Three-year old. On second page of activity, change "enclosured" to "enclosed" in Age Variation for Five-year-old.
C-36-8	Change "psonge" to "sponge" in sentence one of Age Variation for Five-year-old.
C-36-14	Correct directions in Activity to read: "Plan to make vegetabl soup with a small group of children. Make a shopping list and take the group to a nearby grocery store (or purchase them yourself, if the trip is impossible). Be sure the children

ERRATA
(Continued)

Activity	Correction
C-36-14	(Continued from page 2) have an opportunity to discuss the things they want to put into the soup. The next day, children can wash vegetables, peel those that need to be peeled, cut up vegetables, add the tomato juice and/or water and seasonings and plan what they are going to serve the soup in. Carrots, potatoes, celery and turnips are good in soup. Use fresh vegetables, if you can."
C-37-3	Change "employes" to "employs" in Age Variation for Four-year-old.
C-37-13	Change "tempra" to "tempera" in fourth paragraph of Activity section.
C-38-8	Change "watc" to "watch" in Age Variation for Five-year-old.
C-38-9	Change "to" to "too" in Age Variation for Four-year-old.
C-38-12	Add "d" to "encourage" in Activity section
C-41-12	Correct directions in Activity section to read: "Conduct this activity in a part of the room where the container will not interfere with other activities. Plaster of paris should be prepared according to directions on the package. Each child should have a container filled with wet sand. The child makes a design or impression in the sand. The mixed plaster of paris is then poured into impression. (The children can assist in both the mixing and pouring of the plaster of paris.) When the plaster has partially hardened, insert a paper clip which will serve as a wall hanger. Have the children observe the temperature changes as the plaster dries and hardens. It may take several hours, but they must wait until it is completely dry and hardened before removing from the mold."
C-42-5	Delete "tell us" from sentence six and change "there" to "these" in sentence of Activity section.
C-44-1	Change alternative "#3" to "#2" in Age Variation for Five-year-old. Also delete sentence three (Alternative 2 is...child.) from this section.
C-44-9	Add additional "Head, shoulder, 1, 2, 3" to alternative #1.

ERRATA
(Continued)

Activity	Correction
C-44-14	Comments following heading "Comments" should become part of the Activity section.
C-45-6	Add following paragraph to Age Variations for Five-year-old: "This child should know the names and other details of his neighbors, but will not be able to deal with the concept of neighbors who live "far away".
C-45-10	Delete word "phrases" after "Materials".
C-46-14	Change "Explan" to "Explain" in Activity section.
C-48-9	Delete "s" from "blocks" in alternative #1.
C-50-1	Add "Five-year-old" Age Variation to existing "Four-year-old" Age Variation.
C-51-14	Omit Age Variation for Three-year-old.
C-54-9	Comments following heading "Comments" should become part of the Activity section.
C-56-3	Add "ing" to "family" in alternative #4.
C-56-7	Omit activity.
C-58-6	Change "againas" to "against" in "Competency Objective".
C-59-5	Change "Three-year-old" Age Variation to "Four-year-old".
C-59-6	Add 4 and 5 year olds to Developmental Age Range.
	All activities should have a section entitled, "Comments". However, all printed comments should be deleted.

ERRATA

Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files

Activity	Correction
1-8	Use with 4s and 5s.
1-9	Three-year-old may need assistance with this activity.
1-16	Omit activity.
2-7	Do not use pills.
2-9	Take necessary safety precautions before doing this activity.
2-12	Use with 4s and 5s.
3-14	Talk about father animals also.
5-1	Use with 3s, 4s and 5s.
5-3	Use with 4s and 5s.
5-13	Use with 3s, 4s and 5s.
9-2	Use with 5s only.
9-12	Add small chalkboard to Home Visitor Materials.
9-13	Use with 5s only.
10-11	Add oil to Home Materials.
10-14	Baking soda should be used throughout activity.
13-7	The younger child will need help making the car.
13-11	Hard cardboard tubes may be safer to use than broom handles.
13-12	Read the story first.
14-1	Use with Competency 29.
16-5	Use with 4s and 5s.
16-7	Add dry Jello to Home Materials.
17-14	Omit, if too difficult for your children.
18-1	Movable Man will work better if cut from heavy paper.

ERRATA
(Continued)

Activity	Correction
18-8	Change "hope" to "hops".
18-23	Delete activity. (Duplication of 18-3)
19-2	Change "dog" to "animal".
19-3	Use Developmental Learning Material (DLM) sequence cards if available.
19-8	Use with 5s only.
19-12	Change "level" to "lever" in title.
19-15	Use pictures that would be appropriate for your area.
21-1	Change "nuckle" to "knuckle".
21-6	Use with 4s and 5s.
22-6	Pictures do not accompany activity.
23-14	Delete activity. (Duplication of 23-7)
23-17 23-18	Numbers have been omitted from two activities in this competency. Please number activity entitled "No Words" 23-17 and number "Let's Pretend" 23-18.
25-9	Use other wordless stories if these are not available.
29-5	Needs close supervision for three-year-olds.
30-14	Use with 4s and 5s.
34-16	Use with 4s and 5s only.
36-1	Worksheet does not accompany activity.
36-11	Three-year-olds may need assistance with this activity.
38-13	Use worksheet 38-14.
38-14	Use worksheet 38-13.
40-17	Use with 3s, 4s and 5s.
44-14	Use a storybook with pictures of "The Three Bears".

ERRATA
(Continued)

Activity	Correction
51-13	Let child make up his own movements for the animals, if these are too difficult.
53-3	Numbered incorrectly as 52-3.
54-1	Change "hold" to "hole".

CHILD DEVELOPMENT: INSERVICE RESOURCE[1]

Directions: First read over the Introduction. Further directions are given as you proceed through the section. Various activities occur throughout the text. Do not hurry. Stop to consider each question or to carry out each activity.

Introduction

Five-year-old Betty can climb better than three-year-old Eric. Four-year-old Tommy has learned to dress himself, but he still can't tie his shoes.

As you've probably already discovered, there are some things five-year-old children can do that are too difficult for their younger brothers and sisters. Some things a four-year-old has learned to do, a three-year-old won't be able to manage. As you observe each child's progress, you need to be aware of how children grow and develop. Will an activity involving skipping rope be too difficult for a four-year-old child? If you describe something as being red, will the three-year-old understand what you mean?

In this section, you'll be learning about the ways children grow and develop during the preschool years. Not all children develop the same skills at the same age, but the following list gives some skills most children will develop by age three, age four and age five. You can use this information when you plan your home visits and as you watch each child's growth and development.

---

[1]These materials are based on descriptions of children's behavior and development in: Butler, A.L., Gotts, E.E. & Quisenberry, N.L. Early Childhood Programs. Developmental Objectives and Their Use. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975.

The following are observations concerning Meg, a child you are visiting. These are summaries of observations recorded over the three years Meg has been enrolled in your program:

Meg is three-years-old. She can tiptoe and climb. She has a tricycle that she loves to pedal and steer. Meg has begun to button her coat by herself and can wash her hands (but she's not very neat).

It is sometimes difficult to understand what Meg is saying.

The best way to get Meg's attention is to touch her. Action will hold her interest and attention longer.

She recognizes several colors, but sometimes she confuses blue and green. She can put together simple puzzles and recite poems and songs.

Meg has begun to sort items into groups. When she is asked to tell a story about a picture, she simply names the objects shown in the picture.

She has begun to play with other children. She is learning to share (although she's much quicker to share something she doesn't want) and to take turns.

Meg responds to expressions of love and affection.

She talks to herself about what is happening. Imaginary people and things may show up in her play, and she sometimes confuses her dreams with reality.

Meg is four-years-old now. She can hop and skip and balance on one foot for ten seconds. She dresses herself but cannot tie her shoes.

She understands more of what is said to her, and her ability to speak sentences has greatly increased. When she relates events, she is not as easily distracted.

Meg knows all the primary colors. She still enjoys working simple puzzles and puts them together much faster than when she was three.

Meg has learned to put similar or identical objects into classes. She can tell the difference between morning and night. She asks how and why things happen.

Meg can follow a story from pictures and recognize its main theme. She tends to confuse fact and fantasy.

Meg still uses aggression in her contacts with other children. She sometimes criticizes and tries to boss the other children she plays with. Concrete reward, such as candy or bubble gum, is more effective in getting Meg to do what you want than is verbal praise.

She can imagine a story from a series of pictures. She has imaginary companions and pretends to be an adult.

Meg is now five. She has learned to skip rope. She can print her name, although she sometimes reverses letters when she prints. Her speech has become easier for strangers to understand.

Touch is not as important for maintaining Meg's attention anymore. She can sit for longer periods of time without becoming restless.

She is able to spot and point out the major missing details of familiar objects. She can recall a story she hears and acts it out later in detail.

She now knows the difference between morning and afternoon. She can tell how two familiar objects are alike and different.

She enjoys riddles and tells original, fanciful stories in language that is essentially complete in structure.

She is not as aggressive when playing with other children and is more cooperative. She shows kindness toward people she likes and tries to protect her younger brother and her kitten. Praise or disapproval have more effect on her behavior than previously.

She talks about what she wants to be when she grows up. She imagines herself in a role and plays that role.

Using the information above, name five areas in which Meg made substantial progress from the time she was three to the time she was four. List five areas Meg progressed in between ages four and five. Use the progress chart on page 5.

In the following situations, try to predict how Meg would react at age three, age four and age five:

1. A group of children her own age is playing nearby.
2. You're reading a story to her (i.e., will her attention wander, how much of the story will she be able to recall).
3. She is asked to make up a story about a picture.
4. She is asked to share a toy with another child.

A work sheet for this activity is provided on page 6.

Progress from ages three to four:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Progress from ages four to five:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Return to page 4.

	Age Three	Age Four	Age Five
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

This page and page 8 contain possible answers for the activities concerning Meg's progress between ages three and five. They should serve as guidelines for discussion, not as the only correct answers.

Progress from ages three to four:

1. Meg's attention span is longer; she is not as easily distracted as she was at age three.
2. She can put puzzles together faster.
3. She can imagine a story from a picture instead of just naming the objects in the picture.
4. Her ability to repeat sentences has increased.
5. She has learned to dress herself.

Progress from ages four to five:

1. Meg's speech is easier to understand.
2. Her attention span has increased; touch is not as important for keeping her attention.
3. She is more cooperative and less aggressive with other children.
4. She responds to praise or disapproval more than previously.
5. She knows the difference between morning and afternoon (at age four, she only knew the difference between morning and night).

	Age Three	Age Four	Age Five
1.	Meg has begun to play with other children, so she may try to enter into the play.	She will use aggression, criticize and boss other children.	Meg will be more cooperative when playing with other children.
2.	Her attention will wander, unless the story is very short.	She will not be as easily distracted and will follow the story from the pictures.	She will recall the story and be able to act it out later.
3.	She will simply name the objects in the picture.	She will make up a story from the picture.	She will tell an original, fanciful story.
4.	She may share the toy, especially if it's one she doesn't really want.	She may share, especially if she is given some kind of reinforcement for her behavior.	She will probably share the toy.

On each of the following pages, a situation is presented first. Allow your group to discuss the situation and questions. Each situation is followed by a possible solution which you may want to use when conducting group discussions. Members of the group, however, will usually come up with these and other acceptable solutions. Activities in the Day Care and Home Learning Activities Files can be used as examples for the kinds of activities the home visitor could use in these situations.

Sammy is four-years-old. He has been told he will have to wait until after the story to play a game he particularly enjoys. It's obvious that Sammy wants to play the game right now. How will he probably react to being told to wait? How can you best handle the situation?

If Sammy refuses to pay attention to the story and continues to demand to play the game, you should consider whether he needs an activity with more physical action. You might want to rearrange the order of the lesson, allowing him to play first.

You're talking to Rhoda, and her three-year-old sister Mary wants your attention. What are some ways Mary might try to get your attention? What might you do and why do you think it would be effective?

What you do might depend on how Mary is trying to get your attention. If she keeps interrupting your conversation to show you something such as a picture she's drawn, you might want to take time out to look at it. You might try including her in the conversation. You might adapt the activities you have planned for Rhoda so that Mary is working on a similar project and you can divide your attention between them.

Jason, a three-year-old you're visiting, cannot keep his mind on the activities you planned for him. After a few minutes, his mind begins to wander and his attention shifts to other objects in the room. What are some things you might do to help Jason develop a longer attention span?

It is possible that the activities are too hard for Jason. Observe the sorts of things Jason does pay attention to and plan simple activities that center around his interests. For instance, if you are doing a sorting activity, let Jason sort items he likes playing with, such as his toy cars.

Mike, age five, has decided not to do any of the activities you've planned. His mother has tried both threats and bribery. So far, neither has worked. What do you suggest?

Mike may prefer some other kinds of activities. Talk with his mother and find out what Mike's interests are; then plan activities around these interests. It is also possible that his mother is putting too much importance on Mike's completing the assigned tasks. You might talk to her and explain that children Mike's age haven't completely developed the ability to finish a task and that Mike will learn to do this as he gets older.

Carol, age four, is intellectually average for her age level. However, her gross motor skills (being able to use her large muscles, such as her arms and legs, and being able to do such things as hop and skip) are those of a three-year-old. It's difficult to involve her in any kind of physical activity. She usually doesn't enjoy it and will not participate. How could you help Carol develop her gross motor skills?

Try to develop physical activities that center around things Carol is interested in. If she likes music, you might use activities which require her to move in time to the music. Perhaps she would like to try moving in imitation of different animals. Make the activities short at first and be sure to praise her for trying something that is difficult for her.